



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,430	01/28/2004	Brian L. Gibson	H0003690	3601
7590	10/21/2005		EXAMINER	
Scott Jacobson, Esquire Honeywell International, Inc. 101 Columbia Road P.O. Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962-2245			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	
DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/766,430	GIBSON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
William K. Cheung	1713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-66 and 68-70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 and 67 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election of Group I invention, claims 1-18, 76, without traverse is acknowledged. Therefore, in view of lack of traversal to restriction requirement set forth from Response to Restriction Requirement, the restriction set forth by the examiner is deemed proper and is therefore made Final.
2. In view of amendment filed August 19, 2005, the rejection of Claims 1-18, 67 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaneko et al. (US 3,635,856) is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-18, 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaneko et al. (US 3,635,856) as affirmed by product literature of Mitsubishi-Kagaku

Food Corporation, copyright 2002 (c) obtained from website
<http://www.mfc.co.jp/english/index.htm>.

Kaneko et al. (col. 1, line 42-47; col. 3, line 9-30; col. 4, line 45-60; col. 5, line 25-45; col. 5-6, examples I and II) disclose a process for extruding a resin-containing composition comprising: a) providing an extrudable mass comprising at least one extrudable resin and saccharide ester; and b) extruding said extrudable mass to produce an extrudate. As affirmed by product literature of Mitsubishi-Kagaku Food Corporation, copyright 2002 (c), the saccharide ester of Kaneko et al. has a structure that is substantially identical to the saccharide ester of Formula (I) as claimed.

Regarding claims 2-14, Kaneko et al. clearly disclose an amount of saccharide ester for the extruded composition. Regarding the recited "to improve..." of claims 2-14, applicants must recognize that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 19, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Kaneko et al. (col. 3, line 73 to col. 4, line 1) teach away from highly substituted esters. However, the examiner disagrees because the formula (I) as claimed does not require all A to be an ester. A could also be hydrogen as well as claimed. Therefore, the Declaration filed August 19, 2005 is inadequate for overcoming the 102(b) rejection set forth.

Regarding applicants' argument that "unexpectedly found desirable properties and other unexpected advantages", applicants fail to recognize that the presentation of "unexpected results" is an effective method for overcoming a 103 rejection, but the presentation of "unexpected results" is ineffective in overcoming a 102(b) rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K. Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William K. Cheung

Primary Examiner

October 18, 2005

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER